

Illinois U Library

AUGUST 24, 1948

# Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR  
BROADCAST BY STATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.



## Is Our Present Foreign Policy Leading to Peace or War?

*Guest Moderator*, HOUSTON PETERSON

### *Speakers*

JAMES B. RESTON

BARTLEY CRUM

ELLIS M. ZACHARIAS

THOMAS I. EMERSON

*(See also page 12)*

COMING

—August 31, 1948—

## Is the Church Failing Our Youth?

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N. Y.

VOLUME 14, NUMBER 18



\$4.50 A YEAR: 10c A COPY



# CONTENTS



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

## THE BROADCAST OF AUGUST 24:

### "Is Our Present Foreign Policy Leading to Peace or War?"

<i>Mr. PETERSON</i> .....	3
<i>Mr. RESTON</i> .....	4
<i>Mr. EMERSON</i> .....	6
<i>Admiral ZACHARIAS</i> .....	8
<i>Mr. CRUM</i> .....	11
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN .....	12
QUESTIONS, PLEASE! .....	17



## THE BROADCAST OF AUGUST 31:

### "Is the Church Failing Our Youth?"



The Broadcast of August 24, 1948, originated in the Palace Theater, Marion, Ohio, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., EDT, over the American Broadcasting Co. Network.



Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio. Send Subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N. Y. Subscription price, \$4.50 a year. 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

# Illinois U Library *Town Meeting*



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., MODERATOR



AUGUST 24, 1948

VOL. 14, No. 18

## Is Our Present Foreign Policy Leading to Peace or War?

### Announcer:

Tonight we welcome you to Marion, Ohio, where we are the guests of the Marion Chamber of Commerce and Station WMRN. Marion was the home of Warren Gamaliel Harding, before he embarked upon his political career, culminating with his election as the 29th President of the United States in 1920. The Harding Home and Museum is located here and the impressive Harding Memorial is a fitting tribute to Marion's first citizen.

Seventy-five percent of the total industrial activity of the United States and 50 percent of the country's entire population fall within a 500-mile circle of which Marion is the hub. As the first manufacturer of steam shovels, this city of about 38,000 population, is known as the Shovel City of the world. In addition to its extensive industries, it is the center of Ohio's prosperous farming area.

Tonight from the Palace Theater

in Marion we turn to what is probably the most pressing question of the world today—"Is Our Present Foreign Policy Leading to Peace or War?"

Now, to preside over our discussion, in the absence of George V. Denny, Jr., here is Houston Peterson, professor of philosophy at Rutgers University, author and editor of the popular book, *Great Teachers*. Mr. Peterson. (*Applause.*)

### Moderator Peterson:

Good evening, everybody. I'm again glad to substitute for our good friend, George Denny, who continues to enjoy his holiday and to get into shape for a heavy fall schedule, with television beginning on this program in October.

We are happy to be in Marion, Ohio, as guests of the Marion Chamber of Commerce. Passing through Cleveland yesterday morning, I could feel the hot pressure of the American League battle, and



could almost hear Manager Lou Boudreau of the Cleveland Indians conferring secretly with "Satchel" Paige about his next game.

But we are here tonight to discuss a huge question which casts a shadow over ball games and on all things good—"Is Our Present Foreign Policy Leading to Peace or War?" Of course, that policy cannot be fully treated in an hour, but there are elements no one can dodge or overlook, even on a first glance.

How is the Truman policy operating in Turkey and Greece?

How well have we handled the Palestine situation on one hand and the Berlin situation on the other?

Is the Marshall Plan combatting communism, or dividing Europe?

Four able speakers will tackle at least some of these questions tonight. James B. Reston is known to millions of readers for his columns on foreign affairs that have appeared in the *New York Times* during the past decade.

Our second speaker, Thomas I. Emerson, is a distinguished lawyer who held a series of important positions with the Federal Government between 1933 and 1946 and is now professor of law at the Yale Law School.

Rear Admiral Ellis M. Zacharias, Retired, had a career of 38 years in the Navy, of which 25 years were connected with Intelligence work and the affairs of nations.

Another distinguished lawyer, Bartley C. Crum, of California, has long been a specialist on international affairs. He was an advisor to Wendell Willkie in the 1940 campaign, and a member of the President's Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry in Palestine of which experience grew his brilliant book, *Behind the Silken Curtain*. Mr. Crum will speak us from New York.

Our first speaker, James B. Reston, is known in Ohio, I am told as Scottie Reston, for he was brought here from Scotland as a boy. He went to public school in Dayton and worked in publicity at Ohio State University before joining the Associated Press in New York City. As a feature writer on international affairs and Pulitzer prize winner, he has few equals. Mr. Reston. (*Applause*.)

#### Mr. Reston:

Mr. Chairman, a little honest confession probably wouldn't hurt any of us at the beginning of this program. The truth is that none of us knows, or can know, whether our policy is leading to peace or war. The Soviet Union, like the Third German Reich, can make war on the world if it likes and is foolish enough to do so, regardless of our policy! Nevertheless, my own guess is that our policy is leading, not to war, but to a very curious and, probably, a not very pleasant peace.

It is true that very few basic issues have been settled between

the Russians and ourselves. It is also true that the situation in Germany today is tense. But the basic fact remains that war has not started.

In the past three years, there have been more opportunities to go to war, more provocations or excuses for making war, than ever before in history, yet neither side has taken the fatal step.

The Russians pushed hard in Iran in 1946; they encouraged the civil war in Greece; they made their bid for power and attempted the strategy of paralysis in Trieste, France, Italy, and Germany, but in all these places, though they had the power to do so, they did not push the issue to all-out war. I think there is an explanation of this, and I think it lies primarily in the policy of the United States.

In the present state of the world's morality, which is not very high, the best chance of preventing open war, in my judgment, is to make clear to any aggressor that he will be opposed by the armed might of the United States if he attempts to impose his will on regions essential to our security. We are now, I think, trying to impress that fact on the Russians, and on the whole I believe we are succeeding.

Unfortunately, however, the mere absence of open war is not good enough. At the end of the first World War, the slogan of the Soviet Communists was, "Not war, not peace." They didn't want

war because they had suffered enough, but they didn't want peace, either, for their philosophy does not prosper where there is stability or security.

Not war, not peace—that's about where we are now, and that is where we are likely to remain, in my judgment, for some time.

It may be, therefore, that our question tonight is premature. We Americans are an impatient people. We like things to be clear and tidy. We want to know now, here in this hall, tonight, whether our policy is leading to peace or war.

If we will think about it, however, I think we will realize that things are not that easy. This is a generation of transition, and if we must live in an atmosphere of uncertainty, it is scarcely surprising. I think we forget what has happened in the last 20 years, and, forgetting, I think we expect too much both of our own leaders and the Russians.

In the past generation, the location of decisive power in the world has moved out of Europe to the East and the West. In the past few years, not only the location of decisive power, but the very nature of power itself, has been changed by the development of atomic energy.

Now, decisive power rests in the hands not of the British or the French or the Germans, but in the United States and Soviet Russia. These two nations are not only



the two most powerful, but they are also the two least experienced, and the two most different of all the great states. It is not quite reasonable, therefore, to expect such a revolution to pass over very quickly.

Nothing quite like this has ever happened before in history. Greece and Rome, Spain, France, and Britain, all had generations, and some of them even centuries in which to grow into their world responsibility. We and the Russians, however, have been pitchforked into this thing before we were ready, and in our case, before we were willing to assume the leadership of the world.

As a result, there is a great dissatisfaction in the country today. People are bewildered by the disappointing results of their great labors in the war. There is a popular idea that if only we shifted our policy a little, or made this concession or issued that ultimatum, or set up another talk with Stalin, everything might be jake.

Unfortunately it isn't like that. The issues involved now are too basic and complex to be solved easily or quickly. We no longer, as a Nation, have simple choices. They are all difficult, and to some extent, dangerous.

Nevertheless, my feeling on the whole is that we are following a course which will win the respect of history and avoid open war. For the moment, we are undoubtedly too breathless about the chal-

lenge, but just the same I think we are on the right road, and that if we keep plodding on patiently the chances of maintaining an honorable peace are pretty good (*Applause.*)

#### **Moderator Peterson:**

Thank you, Mr. Reston. Not the parting of the ways began. When Thomas I. Emerson left Washington after 13 strenuous years of legal work with the New Deal, he retired to the quieter life of the Yale Law School, but not for long. Professor Emerson was Chairman of the Connecticut Wallace-for-President Committee, and is now candidate for Governor of Connecticut on the Progressive Party Ticket. Mr. Emerson. (*Applause.*)

#### **Mr. Emerson:**

I cannot agree with Mr. Reston that we are on the road to peace—even a curious and not very pleasant peace, as he calls it. Unless we have drastically changed our policy in the current Moscow conversation, we are closer to war right now, than we were six months ago, a year ago, or at any time since V-J Day.

We have not agreed with Russia upon any of the postwar issues. On the contrary, we are near physical conflict over Berlin.

We have not agreed upon any program for control of atomic weapons, or disarmament. On the contrary, we are engaged in a gigantic armament race.

We cannot rely upon a strong United Nations to lead the way to peace. On the contrary, the UN is in danger of collapsing like the League of Nations. We are devoting all our energies to the cold war.

Why are we in this position? Why have we rushed so madly down the road toward the war that nobody can win and that can only result in destruction, horror, and misery for the whole world?

Our present plight is the inevitable result of our bipartisan foreign policy. That policy has come to mean only one thing—a blind, intolerant and unreasoning opposition to the other major power in the world. It is purely a negative policy; a policy of containment; a policy of getting tough, which means getting tougher and tougher; a policy of achieving peace by preparing for war, a policy looking to the ultimate overthrow of Soviet power in Russia.

This is perhaps not surprising when we realize that the policy has been formulated and is being carried out by the military and by the economic royalists. The military are trained for fighting, not for the statesmanship of peace.

Great corporate wealth is driven by greed for profits, by the need for imperialist expansion, and by neurotic fear of any change in the economic status quo. Neither one represents the interest of the common people.

Under this leadership we have

encouraged and supported the most reactionary elements on the globe. We have subsidized the corrupt and feudal governments of Greece and Turkey. We have poured money and supplies into the tottering dictatorship of Chiang Kai-shek. We have placed in power the remnants of Japanese control in Korea. Even more crucial, we are rapidly rebuilding Germany and Japan as military spearheads against Russia, thereby creating again the very situation which led to two world wars.

We are using the Marshall Plan as a political instrument to prevent necessary social and economic change. We are preparing to remilitarize Western Europe.

Our policy is thus dividing the world into two extreme and hostile groups. We are fast ending the possibility of developing a middle ground out of which eventual world stability could be shaped.

Again, in our mania for halting Russia at any cost, we have by-passed and undermined the United Nations. We coldbloodedly abandoned UNRRA. We ignored the UN and the Truman Doctrine. We ignored it again in the Marshall program. Thus, we are destroying the only machinery capable of achieving a united world.

At home, both old parties have combined to stir up the wildest sort of hysteria against Russia. We have aroused the country to such a pitch of hatred, that a solution



of our differences with Russia recedes further and further as each day passes.

I do not say that Russia is without blame in this situation. I do say that our present policy is aggressive, shortsighted, futile, and fraught with death.

All of this is defended on the theory that the Russian's are bent upon aggressive expansion and will yield only to a display of greater force.

Fortunately this basic premise is wrong. Neither the Russian people nor the American people want war, and nothing in the economic, social, or political structures of the two countries compels war.

Hence another solution is possible. That is the program offered by Henry Wallace and the Progressive Party.

It is a program which recognizes that neither communist Russia nor capitalist United States can dominate the world.

It acknowledges the contributions that communism as well as western democracies have made to the welfare of mankind.

It recognizes that Western Europe occupies a middle position between the two that can, perhaps, ultimately bridge the gap.

It calls for mutual tolerance and understanding between the great powers.

It proposes a concrete program for reconciling differences.

It visualizes strengthening the

United Nations and evolution into eventual world government.

The Wallace program is, short, a return to the great vision of Franklin Roosevelt and Wendell Willkie. It offers the choice between inevitable conflict and world peace through intelligent statesmanship. (*Applause.*)

#### **Moderator Peterson:**

Thank you, Mr. Emerson. It is a long way from the bridge of a roaring battleship to a peaceful forum platform in Ohio, but that is the path our next speaker has taken during the past four or five years. As a fighting commander, as the director of psychological warfare against Japan, and the author of the best-seller, *Secret Missions*, Rear Admiral Eli M. Zacharias is triply armed for discussion of foreign policy. Admiral Zacharias. (*Applause.*)

#### **Admiral Zacharias:**

I must disagree with Professor Emerson in every one of his statements, except the one in which he says, "Neither the American or Russian people want war." I agree because the weapons now available will destroy humanity in any future large-scale war. That inescapable fact makes it evident that nobody can win in another war. It is a fact well known to the Politburo, and there is no evidence that Russia is preparing a military attack on us or any other nation. General Clay himself has so stated.

But before anyone can presume



to answer the question, "Is Our Present Foreign Policy Leading to Peace or War?" there must be an accurate spelling out of that policy. Our foreign policy may be stated in simple terms. It is to encourage and support the democratic forces in Europe in order to prevent the aggressive expansion of Soviet Russia and communism.

This policy is the logical corollary to the one which kept Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito from conquering the earth.

We must realize that our present policy in Germany will determine not only our policy in Europe but also our policy for the entire world. As I see it, our policy is one which has for its objective the future peace and security of the world. That is the objective which I want and I believe is the objective desired by every member of this audience.

There are many sincere citizens who disagree with our present foreign policy but there are those, too, whose selfish or confused aims would have us drop atom bombs on Russia tomorrow, and there are those whose fanatical interest in a foreign ideology will cause them to distort our real purposes with accusations of aggressive imperialism.

We are not near physical conflict over Berlin. The road to peace will be filled with serious incidents, but they do not lead to war unless there is a desire for war on the part of the people.

We have offered the atomic secrets to the world if proper safeguards against military use is agreed upon. But for reasons of their own, Russia refuses to go along.

We have supported the United Nations because it is the only media which the nations of the world have for free and full discussion. A tremendous amount of work has been accomplished by it.

Our present policy will have the wholehearted support of all the peoples of the world if it is made known to them in unmistakable terms.

We are fortunate in having a fundamental situation which contributes directly to peace. It is that there is no nation in the world today, except the United States, which is in a condition or equipped to start and maintain a war. It is also a fact that no nation starts a war unless there is a reasonable certainty of being able to bring it to a successful conclusion.

I say this with the full knowledge that in the past dictatorships have resorted to war to perpetuate their powers. Our European Recovery Plan and the measures to support Western European Regional Security are the bases of our foreign policy intended to prevent war and promote peace.

The basic aim of the Marshall Plan is the rehabilitation of Europe necessary for the promotion of democracy.

Regardless of statements to the contrary by those originally opposed to it, recovery is ahead of schedule. It is assisting Europe to bridge the gap and enable them to get back on their feet economically.

Russia has announced that they will do everything possible to prevent the Marshall Plan from working. The Russians know that the Marshall Plan is the one thing which will upset their plans for chaos and control of all Europe.

With the halt of communism in France and Italy, Russia is faced with the only other alternative, a complete about-face.

But to supplement the Marshall plan we need an effective propaganda campaign to correct the false impressions about us throughout the world—impressions created by the Russian campaign of vilification and misstatement.

The decisions which have provoked the present crisis with Moscow are the projects for a separate Western German State and control of the Ruhr. We have overlooked factors of psychological and strategic importance but this policy itself is one designed for peace, namely, economic revival of Germany for the benefit of Europe.

However, I must emphasize that we will have to be realistic about Russia. We will not reach a real agreement with the Russians unless we recognize that they have the same basic fear of

a strong Germany that the French have. Both have learned from sad experiences, repeatedly, that strong Germany is a menace to the peace of Europe. That is why the present meetings at Moscow should bring all parties back to a firm working basis.

We must remember that gratitude, something peculiar even to people, is not in the vocabulary of nations.

We have shown our sincerity in endeavoring to cooperate with the Soviet Union. It is now up to the Russians to come forth with a clear demonstration of their own sincerity, we must tell the Russians in no uncertain terms that if they prefer to delay they may find that it is too late. They should remember what the Japanese forgot—that the cemetery of history is crowded with the graves of nations which were doomed to extinction because they made their decision too late.

With full consideration of these factors, our foreign policy will continue to lead toward peace, and it is at the present time. (Applause.)

**Moderator Peterson:**

Thank you, Admiral Zacharias. Now for our final speaker, Bartley C. Crum, who will be cut in from New York. As another native son of California, I must shake hands with Mr. Crum across the airways. We have never met.

It is not surprising that he can

not be with us in person tonight for he has a busy law practice in San Francisco and in recent months he has been launching a new newspaper, *The New York Star*, successor to *PM*. Mr. Crum, please come in. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Crum:

Thank you, Mr. Peterson. I'd like to make it clear at once that I couldn't disagree more strongly than I do with Mr. Emerson. My chief quarrel with American foreign policy since the war is that it has not been positive enough in its support of peace and world reconstruction through the United Nations.

In other words, I am more unhappy over what we have not done than I am over what we have done. United States came out of the war with incomparable power and prestige. Millions of people all over the world looked to us with hope and confidence that we would show the same leadership in peace that we showed in the great alliance against the Nazis.

The score board now, three years later, shows some runs, some hits, and some errors, but most of all it shows that we have been playing a tight defensive game, afraid of ourselves and afraid of others, too seldom swinging at the ball.

Among the errors, I would name three as important in themselves.

The first seems to me to have been the Truman Doctrine as it

was applied in Greece and Turkey. This was a unilateral step which by-passed the United Nations and which cost us, whatever its strategic justification, a great deal of the world's good will.

The second is our failure to give all-out support to the new State of Israel. We have backed and filled and hesitated here on one of the few issues where a forthright policy would have strengthened us and our friends in every country.

We should lend this new state funds with which to start its existence as a nation. We should give *de jure* recognition at once. We should support its membership application before the United Nations.

This is not a question of being for the Jews or against the Arabs. This is a question simply of recognizing that a Jewish state in Israel means a new advance for civilization, for modern science and engineering, for public health and education, for the great ideas this nation stands for.

The one thing the United States cannot afford to be against is progress, and Israel means progress for the entire Middle East.

The third error which disturbs me is our policy of using the United Nations as expendable in our diplomatic conflict with Russia. This seems to me to be a tragic error. From the very beginning the men who founded the



## THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

**JAMES BARRETT RESTON**—James Reston, diplomatic correspondent for the *New York Times*, was born in Clydebank, Scotland, in 1909, and brought to the United States in 1910. He attended the Vale of Leven Academy in Alexandria, Scotland; the public schools of Dayton, Ohio, and the University of Illinois. Following a year on the Springfield, Ohio, *Daily News*, Mr. Reston worked in the publicity department of Ohio State University. In 1934, he was publicity director for the Cincinnati Baseball Club.

From 1934 to 1937, Mr. Reston was a reporter for the Associated Press in New York City and from 1937 to 1939, in London. In 1939, he became a reporter for the *New York Times* in the London bureau, and since 1941, has been with the Washington bureau.

In 1945, Mr. Reston, was awarded the Pulitzer prize for national correspondence. In addition to his newspaper writing, he is the author of *Prelude to Victory*.

**ELLIS MARK ZACHARIAS**—Rear Admiral Zacharias, USN, retired, is a radio commentator on foreign affairs and author of the recent book *Secret Mission*. Born in Jacksonville, Florida, in 1890, Admiral Zacharias is a graduate of the U. S. Naval Academy. Commissioned an ensign in 1912, he advanced through the grades to rear admiral. During World War I, he served in various capacities aboard battleships, as engineering officer and as gunnery officer. From 1920 to 1923, Admiral Zacharias was an attache to the American Embassy in Tokyo. During this time he was a student of the Japanese language and people. Following several years as officer in charge of the eastern division of the Office of Naval Intelligence, he became district intelligence officer of the 11th Naval District with headquarters at San Diego in 1938.

In 1940, Admiral Zacharias became commander of the cruiser Salt Lake City, in the bombardment of enemy bases on the Gilbert and Marshall Islands. Later he was made commander of the battleship New Mexico, and following that, chief of staff of the 11th Naval District. During part of 1945, he was on temporary duty with the commander in chief of the U.S. Fleet conducting psychological warfare against the Japanese High Command.

Since his retirement in 1946, Admiral Zacharias has engaged in writing and lecturing. He is the author of *Secret Missions*, *The Story of an Intelligence Officer*, *Eighteen Words That Bagged Japan*, and *Balance Sheet of Disaster*.

**BARTLEY CRUM**—Born in San Francisco, California, in 1900, Bartley Crum received his A.B. and J.D. degrees from the University of California. In 1924, he began the practice of law in San Francisco. From 1924 to 1932, Mr. Crum was an instructor of international law in the

Extension Division of the University of California. He served as California chairman of United China Relief, and was adviser to Wendell L. Willkie during the presidential campaign of 1940. He has been chairman of the Independent Republicans for Roosevelt National Committee, consultant to United Nations Conference at San Francisco, and member of the Anglo-American Committee on Inquiry on Palestine.

Mr. Crum recently became a publisher of *The New York Star*, successor to *PM*. He has been a contributor to the *New York Times Magazine*, *Christain Science Monitor Magazine*, *The Nation*, *California Law Review*, and other publications. He is also the author of *Behind the Silken Curtain*.

**THOMAS IRWIN EMERSON**—Mr. Emerson, a professor of law at Yale University, is a candidate for Governor of Connecticut on the Progressive Party Ticket. Born in Passaic, New Jersey, in 1907, he has his A.B., LL.B., and M.A. degrees from Yale. Admitted to the New York bar in 1932, he joined the firm of Engelhard, Pollak, Pitcher & Stern. In 1933, he became assistant counsel for the National Recovery Administration, and later was attorney for the National Labor Relations Board and the Social Security Board. From 1937 to 1940, he was counsel for the National Labor Relations Board.

In 1940, Mr. Emerson became special assistant to the attorney general of the U. S. Dept. of Justice, and the following year associate general counsel in the Office of Price Administration. Later, in turn, he was deputy administrator for enforcement for OPA; general counsel in the Office of Economic Stabilization; and general counsel in the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. Mr. Emerson has been a professor at law at Yale since 1946.

**HOUSTON PETERSON**—Educator, author, lecturer, and radio broadcaster, Dr. Peterson is a professor of philosophy at Rutgers University where he has been a member of the staff since 1929. Born in Fresno, California, in 1897, he attended Pomona College in Claremont where he graduated with an A.B. degree in 1919. The following year he received an A.M. from Columbia and several years later received a Ph.D. from the same university.

Dr. Peterson was on the faculty of Cooper Union from 1938 until 1946. Before that he was chairman of the Cooper Union Forum for several years. He has lectured widely and is heard over the air frequently as an educational broadcaster.

Beside being the editor of a number of books on poetry and related subjects, Dr. Peterson is the author of several books, the latest of which is *Great Teachers*.

United Nations recognized that the making of peace was not properly a responsibility of the United Nations; that this new and maybe last great hope of mankind should be used to keep peace, to work out slowly and patiently the new techniques of collaboration which the world so desperately needs.

But already, in three years, we have come to use the United Nations as the Russians have used it—as a sounding board for our polemics with each other—as a weapon in the cold war. Both our countries seem to me guilty in this respect. If we have, together, already made the word “collaboration” on which the United Nations was founded, a bad and suspicious in men’s ears, we have only ourselves to blame.

These, then, are errors, in my opinion. But I agree with Admiral Zacharias, that there have also been a few hits. I would claim this very quickly. Chief among them is the European Recovery Program, associated with the name of Secretary Marshall. I think that if it had been advanced through the United Nations, it might have been a home-run, but this is not to say that it has not strengthened the United States in every country in the world.

But what we have done is not important, for my money, as what we have not done. Neither the good nor the bad outweighs the opportunities we have missed.

We’ve come, in three short

years, to an impasse in our relations with the Soviet Union, and it is hard for any honest man to say that this could have been avoided.

The Russians are hard to do business with, and much of the blame for our present trouble belongs in the Kremlin. But the Kremlin cannot be blamed for what we have not done to take the leadership of the postwar world. In China, in Eastern Europe, in Western Europe, all over the world there are millions of men and women who survived the last war and want to escape the next.

These people have looked to us to help them, and I think it is impossible for any American patriot, today, to feel proud, except for the Marshall Plan, of what we have done, or to overlook the enormous tasks we have not done.

Nearly six years ago the late Wendell Willkie came back from his trip around the world in the middle of the war and warned us that we were drawing heavily on the reservoir of good will which all Americans inherited from the past. We are still drawing on it. Sooner or later, we must fill it up again. (*Applause.*)

**Moderator Peterson:**

Thank you, Mr. Crum. May I just remark that we are holding a more or less intimate conversation with a man a thousand miles away. You sit there quietly, if not

smugly, but that's the kind of a new world it is, and we've got to think in terms of such magic.

Now if you three gentlemen will join me here around the microphone, and you, Mr. Crum, will imagine yourself here, we'll try a few intellectual body blows before receiving questions from this fine Marion, Ohio, audience. Mr. Reston, as an ex-Ohioan, it is only fair, sir, that you should start things off.

**Mr. Reston:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to pitch a question over to Mr. Crum in New York.

**Mr. Peterson:** It's going to be tough.

**Mr. Reston:** He said, "I think it is impossible for any American patriot to feel proud, except for the Marshall Plan, of what we have done, or to overlook the enormous tasks we have not done." Now, Mr. Crum, as an old sports writer, I don't know how you score hits, runs, and errors, but I would just like to ask you how would you really score American leadership for the United Nations, American leadership in the creation of the World Banking Fund, American leadership for the creation of International Trade Organization, American leadership in the atomic energy proposals, and the Marshall Plan which you have mentioned, of course, and the relief programs of the United States before the Marshall Plan?

**Mr. Crum:** Well, Mr. Reston,

I think you're right, and I should have mentioned those things. Those, too, are things of which every American can be proud.

**Mr. Peterson:** Thank you, Mr. Crum. We'll come back to you probably in a moment. Admiral Zacharias, you have something for Mr. Emerson.

**Admiral Zacharias:** Yes, I'd like to address a question to Mr. Emerson. I disagree so much with what you said that I hardly know where to start. What makes you think that the military and, as you call them, the economic royalists, have anything to gain by war?

**Mr. Emerson:** What I said was that the military are trained in the arts of war. That is their profession. That is what they're brought up to do. They are not trained in the arts of peaceful statesmanship. As to the economic royalists, which was the term that Franklin Roosevelt used, they do have a good deal to gain out of our present foreign policy.

They have, first of all, profits from large war contracts. Second, they have expansion of economy from the armament program. Third, they have the expansion into other countries which is being brought about by the Marshall Plan.

**Admiral Zacharias:** Well, if I may reply there, I think that's one of the old pacifist theories that the military and the economic royalists, as you call them, want



war because they hope to get something out of it. As for the military, we know what war is. If you've had to duck bombs and watch for torpedoes under the water, and dodge shells landing alongside of you and making hits, you'll know that it's no fun and we want to have no part of it if it can be avoided. All you have to do is ask the wives of the military men what they feel about war. They'll tell you.

As for the other people, gaining anything by war, you know that—as it's usually referred to, Wall Street—when war starts everything goes to pieces and there's nothing to gain. You must not overlook the fact that the efforts of those people are for the furtherance of the economic facilities of the country in their desires, which are to get sources of raw materials and markets, as far as possible. I do not believe that they ever think in terms of war, as being of direct benefit to them. If they do, I'd like to hear about it.

**Mr. Peterson:** Thank you, Admiral Zacharias. Now Mr. Emerson has another question.

**Mr. Emerson:** I'd like to ask Admiral Zacharias this question. He has said that a strong Germany is a menace to the peace of Europe. Isn't it true, Admiral, that our present policy is creating exactly that menace and very rapidly, too? Isn't it true that our failure to break up the big trusts

of Germany, our failure to remove the big industrialists who control private German industry—isn't it true that our increase of heavy industry in Germany, that the failure to break up the landed estates in Germany, and the whole failure to democratize Germany, and our use of the Marshall Plan, is building up Germany just as it was before as a menace to the peace of Europe?

**Admiral Zacharias:** I must answer that categorically, no, it is not true. Both in Japan and Germany, it has been indicated that any revival, any rehabilitation in the economic field is for the purpose of getting the nations concerned and the rest of the world back on their feet.

Now as for Germany becoming a strong menace in the future, General Marshall has gone on record as saying that he's willing to enter into a 40-year pact in order to ensure that Germany does not rearm in a military way.

If we can convince Russia that that is our aim as far as Germany is concerned, I think it will remove one of her great fears about Germany and will bring her to talk about peace.

**Mr. Peterson:** Mr. Crum, we aren't neglecting you, sir. I wonder if you haven't a question for, say, Mr. Reston. We have just a little more time.

**Mr. Crum:** No, I don't. I do have a question, however, for Mr. Emerson. I noticed that at the

end of his initial statement, he said that the Wallace Program was that of F.D.R. and Wendell Willkie—that it was a return to that. I'd like to ask Mr. Emerson if he thinks that Mr. Wallace, or anyone else, can say what F.D.R. or Wendell Willkie would do if they were alive today.

**Mr. Emerson:** It's certainly not possible to say what either one would do under the special circumstances of today, but the policy which they followed generally was perfectly clear, it seems to me. It was a policy of understanding and tolerance for the problems of the Soviet Union. It was a policy in which they recognized the interests of the Soviet Union to security with respect to the nations around them. It was a policy which was worked out at the Yalta and Potsdam agreements, worked out in the United Nations, and worked out in UNRRA. It was a policy which President Truman has not followed.

**Mr. Peterson:** Thank you, Mr. Emerson. The time speeds on. There are so many questions here from these four speakers themselves that I'm having trouble keeping them back. But while we get ready for our question period, I'm sure that you our listeners will be interested in the following message.

**Announcer:**

You're listening to America's Town Meeting of the Air, origi-

nating in Marion, Ohio, where we are the guests of the Marion Chamber of Commerce and station WMRN. We are discussing the question, "Is Our Present Foreign Policy Leading to Peace or War?" You have just heard from James B. Reston, Thomas I. Emerson, Rear Admiral Ellis M. Zacharias and Bartley Crum. We are about to take questions from our audience.

In the meantime, let me remind you that, for your convenience, we print each week a complete text including the questions and answers in the Town Meeting Bulletin which you may secure by writing to Town Hall, New York 18, New York, enclosing ten cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing. Allow at least two weeks for delivery.

If you would like to subscribe to the Bulletin for six months, enclose \$2.35, or for a year send \$4.50. Or if you would like a trial subscription, enclose \$1 for eleven issues.

School officials who wish to use the Town Meeting Bulletin in their classrooms during the coming school term should write for their subscriptions now.

Next week your Town Meeting will originate in Grand Rapids, Michigan, where we will be the guests of the Christian Youth Conference of North America and station WLAV. The Christian Youth Conference of North America is a quadrennial conference sponsored

by the United Christian Youth Movement which numbers in membership over ten million young people. This movement is the official coordinating agency for 40 leading protestant denominations,

as well as such agencies as the Girl and Boy Scouts, Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A., State Youth Councils, and others. Now, for our question period, we return to our guest moderator, Mr. Peterson.

## QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

*Mr. Peterson:* Tonight, some 1,500 people are gathered in the Palace Theater of Marion, and they are evidently eager to put questions to our four students of America's foreign policy. Our assistants are in the aisles with portable microphones. People with questions are holding up their number cards to indicate the speakers to whom the question is directed. We start with a question, I can see in this darkened aisle here, for Mr. Reston.

*Man:* My question is directed to Mr. Reston. Would it be wise to create a western capital of Germany if agreement cannot be reached in Berlin?

*Mr. Reston:* Well, that, as you know, is one of the major issues in the present Moscow conversations and there is in this country today and I think even in Washington, considerable difference of opinion as to whether or not it would be wise. I think, however, that the United States, Britain, and France are already rather deeply committed, both to the German people and to each other to proceed with the creation of a German capital in the West, or, that

is to say, at least a provisional German government in the West. If the implication of your question is, "Should we pull out of Berlin and create a new capital in the West," I do not think we should do that.

*Mr. Peterson:* Here's a gentle looking lady with a number 2 card. That is for Mr. Emerson.

*Lady:* I'm a teacher of American government in the local high school. How can you advocate mutual compromise with Russia when Russia hamstringing the United Nations with the veto and pursues such aggression as she showed in Czechoslovakia?

*Mr. Emerson:* I would say that the Russian position in Czechoslovakia was a result of the cold war. It was a step taken by Russia in order to consolidate her position in view of the approaching conflict and the approached tenseness of the situation.

With respect to the veto, I would say that the United Nations will never function satisfactorily—and remember the United States insisted on a veto from the beginning—as long as the two major



powers of the world are at each other's throats as they are now.

*Mr. Peterson:* Thank you, Mr. Emerson. Now in the right aisle I see two questions for Admiral Zacharias. We'll take the first one.

*Man:* My question is to Admiral Zacharias. Does it appear that the present Russian foreign policy will lead to war and not the American foreign policy?

*Admiral Zacharias:* You'll have to repeat that a little more sharply, sir.

*Man:* Does it appear that the Russian present foreign policy will lead to war and not the American foreign policy?

*Admiral Zacharias:* I might answer it in this way: That, if Russian had a stock pile of the atomic bombs today, and we had not, I'm fearful as to what would happen. *(Applause.)*

*Mr. Peterson:* Here's a frail looking lady in white with a question for you Mr. Crum, get ready, sir.

*Lady:* Has the United States done anything that we common people don't know about, that causes our government to submit to Russia's anti-food supply policy?

*Mr. Crum:* I'm sorry I didn't get the question.

*Lady:* Has the United States done anything that we common people don't know about, that causes our government to submit to Russia's anti-food supply policy?

*Mr. Crum:* Do you refer to the anti-food supply in Berlin?

*Lady:* Yes.

*Mr. Crum:* Of course, I have a means of knowing the answer to that question; I'm not in government, I'm a private citizen. I would say, as I tried to say earlier that both major powers, the Soviet Union and the United States are behaving very badly, in my judgment. I have hoped, as an American, that our country would act to the fullest extent possible through the United Nations. As an American citizen, believe very strongly that we will only have permanent peace in the world if these two major powers first agree to the elimination of the veto power in the United Nations.

*Mr. Peterson:* Thank you, Mr. Crum. Admiral Zacharias wants to say a word to that question also.

*Admiral Zacharias:* I think Russia regrets now the establishment of the activity regarding food in Berlin, because of the depletion of the supplies in the Russian zone—that is the cause of the disorders that have taken place there. I think it was a misstep by Russia and is now reacting upon her.

*Mr. Peterson:* There are too many questions for Admiral Zacharias. They're all trying to get a job in the Navy, Admiral. He is Retired, remember. Here's another delicate looking lady with number one.

*Lady:* My question is to Mr.

Reston. How can foreign countries make long term economic plans when Congress passes tariff regulations, trade treaties and ERP operations on a yearly basis?

*Mr. Reston:* Well, there is no way under our Constitution that the Executive Branch of the Government can bind future Congresses to a given policy. It is, however, generally recognized that if the Executive Branch of the Government does commit itself, or does indicate to another country that we will follow a given line of policy and the Congress accepts the principle of that policy, that point will seriously be taken into consideration by future Congresses. But it is right, and you do raise a very basic question, which has bothered our State Department for a number of years, namely, how can we, with a divided form of government, commit ourselves to a long range policy when the appropriation has to pass through Mr. John Taber once a year.

*Mr. Peterson:* Thank you, Mr. Reston. Another question here for Mr. Emerson.

*Lady:* I should like to ask Mr. Emerson. Does he mean that we are to allow the people of Europe and Asia to starve and suffer?

*Mr. Reston:* No, I certainly do not; I'm not sure what your questions refers to.

*Lady:* Well, you said that we shouldn't be doing the things in Europe that we are doing now.

*Mr. Reston:* If you're referring

to the Marshall Plan, the Marshall Plan is applicable only at the present time to Europe. I am not opposed to United States aid for the economic reconstruction and rehabilitation of Europe and the backward countries of the world. I am heartily in favor of it. I am opposed to the way the Marshall Plan is being administered which is in part as a means of increasing and rebuilding the power of Germany.

*Mr. Peterson:* Here's another question in the second aisle for Admiral Zacharias.

*Man:* My question is addressed to Admiral Zacharias. Do you believe our foreign trade, allowing a yearly inflationary deficit of seven billion dollars in goods, puts us in an economic position to forestall war?

*Admiral Zacharias:* I don't think that the trade now going on or the exports that we're making have anything to do with the coming or war or the prevention of war. I do feel, however, that the orderly flow of materials from this country sets up a condition here which is favorable to us and will result ultimately in advantage to the rest of the world.

That is one of the reasons for the great benefit of the Marshall Plan in both directions. None of these things are ever going to be one-sided. We hope to get something out of them in all directions and for everybody concerned.

*M. Peterson:* Here in the right

aisle is another question for Mr. Crum. Yes, Madam.

*Lady:* Is it conceivable that our present Administration creates the atmosphere that war is imminent to convince Americans not to change horses in midstream?

*Mr. Crum:* I do not believe so. I do not believe for one moment that any responsible officer of our Government, anyone in power, would do such a dastardly thing. In my opinion, there is certainly no intention on the part of the American Government to precipitate a war either to remain in power or for any other purpose.

*Mr. Peterson:* Thank you, Mr. Crum. Your hearing is excellent tonight, sir. The lady here in the left hand aisle with another question for Admiral Zacharias.

*Lady:* The question is to Mr. Zacharias. Do you think that the Marshall Plan is honestly aiding the cause of peace, or in reality upsetting our own economy by playing Santa Claus?

*Admiral Zacharias:* Is the Marshall Plan upsetting the cause of peace? I feel confident that the Marshall Plan is the one instrument of national policy that we have at our disposal today and it's vitally necessary in order to assist Europe in the economic rehabilitation, so that they can get on their feet. Without that, Europe will go into chaos and create the conditions which will ultimately run into war. Therefore, the Marshall

Plan is a peace effort and nothing else.

*Mr. Peterson:* Have you had time to gather your forces against Mr. Reston? Here's a question for you, sir.

*Man:* My question to Mr. Reston is: Can Russia subdue the United States without war?

*Mr. Reston:* I do not believe it can, sir. It raises a question for us, I think, that the power of Nazi Germany never did raise. It has a cunning system of aggression by infiltration. This is an extremely free and easy country. If it has atomic energy at its disposal, it is conceivable that in so highly industrialized society as this might, through the planting of atomic bombs in key areas in this country, do as great damage for time. I do not believe, however, that it would paralyze this country or defeat this country either with or without a war.

*Mr. Peterson:* Admiral Zacharias can't quite resist this question.

*Admiral Zacharias:* No. I'd like to say that if anybody has any hopes or fears that any nation in the world will start another war using any of the weapons that are now available, I want to assure them that these weapons will be returned to them a hundredfold. If they have any such illusions that they can start a war and be successful in it, that fact in itself should remove any such desire. I think that that is the correct situation.



ation today. I hope that with the realization of that, no nation will think that they can start a war and gain anything from it. (*Applause.*)

*Mr. Peterson:* Thank you, Admiral Zacharias. Now there are three gentlemen there with a question for Mr. Emerson, who is a very short man. I wish you'd try to tie up those three questions into one, if you can. Now, quickly gentlemen. You, sir.

*Man:* My question to Mr. Emerson is this: You indicated, I believe, that the present policy of the United States has weakened UNRRA. What, in your opinion, has Russia contributed toward the strengthening of UNRRA and how?

*Mr. Emerson:* I assume you refer to the United Nations rather than to UNRRA, which was the relief organization. Is that correct? As I said before, I feel that UNRRA will never succeed under the present conditions in which two major powers are in complete conflict with each other. I think that the fact that the Russians have used the veto to the extent that they have, simply means that the United States and the countries which go along with her have been in the majority, and that there is an expression through UNRRA of a disagreement. The problem is to solve that basic agreement and then you can use UNRRA.

*Mr. Peterson:* Mr. Crum, since our audience can't see you, they're

neglecting you a little, sir. What question should they have asked you, tonight, sir? Would you please state that and then answer it briefly but brilliantly.

*Mr. Crum:* I would like to comment on the remark Mr. Emerson just made. I think it's quite clear that one of the reasons the United Nations has not worked successfully has been the over use of the veto power by the Soviet Union. It is quite true, as one of the speakers pointed out, that at the beginning of the United Nations, we did insist upon the veto power being included in the Charter. So did the Soviet Union.

We've had considerable experience with the use of the veto since the United Nations was started, and, as an American, one who hopes very much that this great institution for the establishment of peace will succeed, I should think that one of the first things that would occur to anyone would be to eliminate the veto power, and that all of the nations of the world should abide by majority decisions.

*Mr. Peterson:* Thank you, very much, Mr. Crum. Now here's a question—probably the final one—for Admiral Zacharias.

*Man:* Admiral Zacharias, how do you propose to penetrate effectively the Iron Curtain of Russia with your propaganda program?

*Admiral Zacharias:* Would you want me to tell you if I knew? I can say that the results we ob-

tained through the psychological warfare against the Japanese High Command, toward the closing phase of the last war, which had for its objective the bringing about of unconditional surrender without the necessity of a forced invasion of the Japanese Island, and since surrender we found that that was effective, I believe that we can have the same effectiveness on the Politburo, if we can speak to them in strong and unmistakable terms. (*Applause.*)

*Mr. Peterson:* Now, while our speakers prepare their summaries of tonight's questions, here is a special message of interest to you.

*Announcer:* Tonight you have heard a discussion of our foreign policy. The success of our international relations depends upon the good will of other countries toward us. The best ambassador of good will is the organization CARE. In spite of what the United States Government is doing to rehabilitate foreign economies, the help of individuals in providing immediate day-by-day relief to millions of Europeans must continue.

Malnutrition and disease flourish despite improved crops and increased supplies of certain foods. CARE is the most efficient and economical agency for sending help to hungry people abroad. Approved by the United States Government, CARE works under favorable agreements with foreign countries.

Because it operates on a non-profit basis, packages are supplied and delivered for less than they would cost if sent any other way. For \$10, CARE guarantees delivery of a 21½ pound, 41,000-calorie food package to any individual or group in 15 countries of Europe. If you don't know someone you would like to help, one of CARE member agencies will choose a needy family for you.

Information may be obtained at CARE offices throughout the country or write to Director of Information, CARE, 50 Broad Street, New York. But, better still, send \$10 for a food package. Now for the summaries of tonight's discussion here is your guest moderator, Mr. Peterson.

*Mr. Peterson:* At first we shall call in Mr. Bartley Crum, speaking from New York. Mr. Crum.

*Mr. Crum:* Thank you, Dr. Peterson. With Mr. Reston, I think it is literally impossible for anyone to say decisively that our foreign policy will or will not lead to war. We, in America, are following, as I see it, a policy of calculated risk, one which may lead to war, but a policy which we hope, all of us, will lead to peace. I hope that our country, above all others, leaves nothing undone which will mean peace with honor.

*Mr. Peterson:* Thank you, Mr. Crum. Now, a final word from Admiral Zacharias.

*Admiral Zacharias:* As long as diplomacy cannot break down the

persistence of those seeking more power by aggressive expansion, we are forced to remain strong in a military way. But our policy which recognizes the needs of other nations will pave the way by eliminating the basic fears behind which and upon which the wars of Europe have been created in the past.

The weapons available today will make wars both unprofitable and undesirable. Through their very destructiveness they have paved the way for an unlimited era of peace. That is the direction in which our policy leads today.

*Mr. Peterson:* The summary of Mr. Emerson.

*Mr. Emerson:* My position is that our foreign policy at present is the ancient, unimaginative fatal policy of militarism of blocking Russia by whatever force we can muster. That path has always led to war. This time it will mean atomic war. I say there is another road. That is to reach an understanding with Russia based upon the mutual interests of each country and upon a common endeavor to better the lot of mankind throughout the world.

*Mr. Peterson:* Now the young man from Ohio, Mr. James Reston, has a final word.

*Mr. Reston:* Mr. Peterson, I agree with Mr. Crum that we have made certain mistakes, that we have often been uncertain and even inconsistent in our foreign

policy, and that recently we have been thinking perhaps more about stopping bad things than about doing good things.

Nevertheless, I maintain that the good far outweighs the bad, that the world is a little better fed, a little more hopeful, a little more secure and certainly a more decent place as a result of our policy overseas in the past few years.

Finally, though the world's need for our aid is even greater than the aid we have given, I think it is fair to say this that never in history has any nation ever moved so far, so fast toward the acceptance of world responsibilities as the United States has in the past ten years. It is an honorable record of which every American can be proud. If we persist in it positively, I believe it will help to maintain peace.

*Mr. Peterson:* Thank you, Mr. Reston. Thank you, Thomas Emerson. Thank you, Admiral Zacharias, and Bartley Crum for a fearless discussion of a pretty fearful question. Thanks to our host, the Marion Chamber of Commerce, and Station WMRN; our special bows to J. B. Bray, chairman of the Host Committee; Hugh Webster, Executive Secretary of the Marion Chamber of Commerce; Robert Mason, Station Manager of WMRN; and the *Marion Star* for their generous cooperation.

Don't forget that next week your Town Meeting will come to you



from Grand Rapids, Michigan, where we will be the guests of the Christain Youth Conference of North America and the Station WLAV. Our subject is, "Is the Church Failing Our Youth?" and our speakers Gil Dodds, the "Flying Parson"; Miss Helen F. Storen, Assistant Professor of Education, Queens College, New York, and member of the Corpus Christi

Catholic Church Youth Forum. Dr. Luther Wesley Smith, and Edward Hawley, former president of the National Pilgrim Fellowship.

Your guest moderator will be Clifton Utley, radio commentator and former director of the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations. He will plan to be with us next Tuesday and every Tuesday at the sound of the Crier's Bell.

**STILL AVAILABLE at \$1.00 (Postpaid)**

A limited number of copies of

## **500 HOURS OLD**

A record of the first 500 broadcasts of "America's Town Meeting of the Air," including in its 48 pages - - -

**Titles and Panels of all 500 Programs**

**Names of all 1176 Speakers**

**Thirty-two Photographs, etc.**

**Order from Town Hall, Inc., 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y.**

# Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR  
BROADCAST BY STATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.



U. S. Pat. Off.

Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

## Is the Church Failing Our Youth?

*Guest Moderator,* CLIFTON UTLEY

### *Speakers*

GIL DODDS  
HELEN F. STOREN

LUTHER WESLEY SMITH  
EDWARD HAWLEY

*(See also page 15)*

### COMING

—September 7, 1948—

**Are the Congressional Spy Investigations  
Serving the National Interest?**

—September 14, 1948—

**What Hope for Man?**

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N. Y.



# CONTENTS



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

## THE BROADCAST OF AUGUST 31:

### "Is the Church Failing Our Youth?"

Mr. UTLEY .....	3
Miss STOREN .....	5
Dr. SMITH .....	7
Mr. DODDS .....	9
Mr. HAWLEY .....	11
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN .....	15
QUESTIONS, PLEASE! .....	17



## THE BROADCAST OF SEPTEMBER 7:

### "Are the Congressional Spy Investigations Serving the National Interest?"



## THE BROADCAST OF SEPTEMBER 14:

### "What Hope for Man?"



The Broadcast of August 31, 1948, originated in the Civic Auditorium, Grand Rapids, Michigan, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., EDT., over the American Broadcasting Company Network.



Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio. Send Subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N. Y. Subscription price, \$4.50 a year. 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.